

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated February 24, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on or about May 23, 2006.

Claims 1, 6, 20, 24, and 30 are hereby amended. Claims 1–21, 24–26, and 28–35 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1–21, 24–26, and 28–35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,195,422 to Jones et al. (hereinafter “Jones”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 1 and requests reconsideration. Claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “sending an initial address message having a *call forwarding* redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an origination switch.” (*emphasis added*). As discussed in the telephone interview, nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and its dependent claims 2–5, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 6 and requests reconsideration. Claim 6 is allowable in that it recites “sending a first initial address message having a *call forwarding* redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an

origination switch.” As discussed in the telephone interview, nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6, and its dependent claims 7 and 32–35, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 8 and requests reconsideration. Claim 8 is allowable in that it recites “determining whether the call is a forwarded call, wherein determining includes sending a first initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value.” As discussed in the telephone interview, nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8, and its dependent claims 9–13, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 14 and requests reconsideration. Claim 14 is allowable in that it recites “determining whether a call is forwarded call, wherein determining includes sending a first initial address message having a redirection counter set to a maximum value.” As discussed in the telephone interview, nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 14, and its dependent claims 15–19, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 20 and requests reconsideration. Claim 20 is allowable in that it recites “sending an initial address message having a *call forwarding* redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at an origination switch.” As discussed in the telephone interview, nothing in Jones teaches or

suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 20, and its dependent claim 21, are allowable over Jones.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 24 and requests reconsideration. Claim 24 is allowable in that it recites “generating an initial address message based on a first telephone number associated with a call from an originating telephone station, the initial address message having a *call forwarding* redirection counter set to a maximum allowed value at the originating station.” As discussed in the telephone interview, nothing in Jones teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24, and its dependent claims 25, 26, and 28–31, are allowable over Jones.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.


Amdt. dated July 5, 2006

Final Office Action dated February 24, 2006

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant